Active Anthropological Archeology

Alan P. Sullivan, III, John A. Hanson, and Rebecca A. Hawkins

Although much overused, the term anthropological archeology has at least two meanings. Its most accustomed meaning describes an approach for interpreting patterning in the archeological record in behavioral or evolutionary terms.[1] A second, less commonly appreciated meaning is the extent to which archeologists, in the execution of their research programs, develop and employ their skills as cultural anthropologists. Certainly, no practicing archeologist who is aware of the discipline's history can deny that native peoples have been involved in archeological research, to varying degrees, since the first observations were made of archeological phenomena, as Curtis Hinsley has reminded us in his thoughtful *Savages and Scientists.*[2] As the *fin de siecle* approaches, however, anthropological archeology more than ever means crafting intercultural understandings that pertain to the archeological record as a "multiple-use" resource. Readers of *CRM*, the *SAA Bulletin*, and their regional counterparts (e.g., *Arizona Archaeological Council Newsletter, Ohio Archaeological Council Newsletter*) no doubt are familiar with the range of opinions, some, lamentably, highly partisan and divisive, that have swirled around protocols for deciding the disposition of prehistoric human remains. We would argue that, as a consequence of the well-intentioned involvement of native peoples in these matters, their role in archeological research actually too often has been reduced to a scripted formality codified in PMOAs (Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement). This article, in contrast, describes some aspects of our working relationship with the Hopi Cultural Resource Advisory Team (HCRAT) that have transpired over the past several years. Specifically, we illustrate the extent of Hopi contributions to our archeological research by discussing their multifaceted involvement with a long-term, multi-phase project—the Upper Basin Archaeological Research Project (UBARP)—on the Kaibab National Forest in northern Arizona.

UBARP and the Hopi

In a cooperative effort, the University of Cincinnati and Kaibab National Forest have committed resources to investigate prehistoric (AD 900-1300) occupational patterns in an area known as the Upper Basin, which is located just south of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. This area and its environs, which are part of a distinctive downfaulted segment of the Coconino Plateau along the eastern south rim of the Canyon itself, are ritually important to the Hopi people. For example, that portion of the Upper Basin that has received the bulk of UBARP's archeological investigation during the past six years is located fewer than 25 km from the travertine dome in the gorge of the Little Colorado River that represents the Hopi peoples' point of emergence from a previous world.[3] The area also is traversed by historic trade-routes that connected the Hopi with other native groups, especially the Havasupai, and along which the Hopi guided early Spanisl explorers.[4] Two research topics that UBARP has focused on, prehistoric land-use patterns and modes of site abandonment, have profited in particular from Hopi involvement during research activities rather than after their conclusion.

Dalton Taylor (second from left), member of the Hopi Cultural Resource Advisory Team, discusses aspects of a rock-art site with Kirsten Gay (far left, Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati), Chad Graham (center, Department of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati), Daniel Sorrell (second from right, Kaibab National Forest), and Alan Sullivan (far right, Department of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati).

Landscape History. Intensive survey of 13 square kilometers of dense pinyon-juniper woodland in the Upper Basin has located a number of rock-art sites that date from late Archaic (A.D. 300) through late prehistoric times (A.D. 1300). During the past several years, a few Hopi men have been taken to view some of these sites. Interestingly, they routinely asked whether any pueblo sites are located nearby; based on our survey results we know, in many cases, that pueblo ruins are found in close proximity. As it turns out, the co-occurrence of rock-art and habitation sites is a material justification for the Hopi to assert that the surrounding archeological landscape is, indeed, largely of Hisatsinom (ancestral Hopi) origin. Thus, it seems to us that not only are rock-art sites a significant symbolic component of the contemporary cultural landscape of Hopi people, but when they are associated with pueblo ruins, all of these sites are invested with political significance. In addition, members of the HCRAT have commented that without archeologists surveying in areas where they do and, most importantly, without archeologists informing them of the results of their work, they would have no physical proof of the existence of ancestral cultural resources beyond the Hopi reservation. This example illustrates how institutions with dedicated cultural research resources, in this case the USDA Forest Service and a large public university, can profitably engage native peoples' perspectives on heritage management by directly including them in the research process. Inexplicably, these kinds of productive dialogues rarely seem to appear in the literature.

Abandonment Hypotheses. As noted above, native peoples routinely have responded to cases where prehistoric human remains have been encountered, and the Upper Basin is no exception to this general pattern. As part of the process for securing an ARPA excavation permit, UBARP research designs are circulated annually to the Arizona SHPO, the ACHP, and tribes in the area that historically have occupied the Grand Canyon area.

In 1992, a secondary burial was encountered at Site MU 125. This was an unprecedented discovery because, until then, few prehistoric human remains had ever been found between the Grand Canyon and Flagstaff. However, the notification procedures outlined in the research design were followed, especially the stipulations that called for cessation of work in all proveniences affected

by the remains. Shortly thereafter, the site was visited by members of HCRAT and the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. In addition to agreeing upon some procedures for protecting and, ultimately, for reburying the remains, we took the opportunity to discuss with the Hopi some puzzling aspects of site MU 125's archeological context. Excavation in a variety of contexts had produced a high frequency of groundstone fragments; in addition, few complete artifacts were found in a burned room where charred roof material and architectural debris lay directly upon the floor. These characteristics of MU 125 are in sharp contrast to those of Site 17, a nearby site where complete groundstone artifacts and other intact artifacts, such as ceramic vessels, were found undisturbed on the floors of burned structures.

According to the Hopi, it is not unreasonable to assume that portions of Site MU 125 were deliberately burned, and potentially usable artifacts, such as groundstone, were intentionally shattered, to achieve "closure" on the settlement's abandonment. In other words, by eliminating the possibility that, after being abandoned, Site MU 125 could be revived, people would have to dedicate themselves instead to making their new settlement thrive. Based on a more complete sample of subsurface contexts, we now think that, in fact, abandonment of MU 125 had been planned (only a handful of unbroken objects have ever been recovered) and that return was not anticipated and, most likely, was definitely discouraged. In addition, it should be noted that another reason given by the Hopi for the abundant groundstone fragments was that, because they are so visible on the ground's surface, they were overt signals that this Hisatsinom settlement (MU 125) had been sealed and that further use of the site was unwarranted.

Native Peoples and Archeological Research

In closing, we would like to comment on several aspects of our experiences with the Hopi that have consequences for the conduct of archeological inquiry in the United States. American archeology has evolved to the point where, at least with respect to research conducted on federal lands, the opinions of native peoples must be actively pursued. Gone are the days, hopefully, when archeologists consult native peoples only (i) because they must in order to secure a permit or (ii) as an afterthought. The direct involvement of Hopi people in UBARP exemplifies how the set of potential interpretations of archeological variation can be expanded to the benefit of all. Our collective experience has been that knowledge of the cultural past, in this case conceptions of how prehistoric pueblo people may have used upland woodland environments a millennium ago, has been amplified by actively engaging the Hopi in matters that routinely face archeologists, e.g., ascertaining sources of assemblage variation and testing hypotheses regarding settlement abandonment processes. Approached in this fashion, we are optimistic that archeological research ultimately will become unquestionably anthropological in both scope and content.

Notes

1 For example, see *Anthropological Archaeology* by Guy Gibbon (Columbia University Press, 1984).

2 *Savages and Scientists* by Curtis Hinsley (Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981).

3 *On the Edge of Splendor* by Douglas W. Schwartz (School of American Research Press, 1990).

4 *The Grand Canyon: Intimate Views* edited by Robert C. Euler an Frank Tikalsky (University of Arizona Press, 1992).

Dr. Alan P. Sullivan III is Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio. Dr. John A. Hanson is Forest Archeologist for Kaibab National Forest, Williams, Arizona. Ms. Rebecca A. Hawkins is President of Algonquin Consultants, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio and tribal archeologist for the Shawnee Nation, United Remnant Band.

Canadian/US Curatorial Services
Joint Ventures Proposed

Ann Hitchcock
Rodger McNicoll

Continuing a tradition of joint meetings, begun in 1990 (see *CRM*, Vol. 17, No. 3, p. 27), between Parks Canada and U.S. National Park Service officials, curators of both agencies met last August to share ideas and strategies in areas o mutual concern. The meeting was held at Campobello.

Follow-up Actions

This first meeting of NPS and Parks Canada curators was characterized by mutual discovery that the two curatorial programs have several overlapping concerns that would benefit by sharing of developmental activities, analyses, an decisions. The group identified follow-up actions, or joint ventures, that would be mutually beneficial, that will be ini tiated now, and will show results in the near term. The actions are summarized below.

Information Sharing

Share information on the selection / development of colle tion management database management systems, including software evaluation and data standards. Parks Canada will provide NPS information on and copies of the Visual Dictionary as it develops.

Planning and Training

Invite individuals from the other organization to participate in collection management planning project teams. Open training opportunities to individuals from both organizations and advertise accordingly. Promote exchanges of personnel between the two organizations. Establish a proto col to facilitate the above planning and training.

Communications

Establish a joint electronic bulletin board for museum pr fessionals in Parks Canada and NPS, through Internet or other means. Share information on planning, training, research developments, standards, exhibit and interpretive development, conservation, and other issues.

Critical Issues Workshop

In 1996, present a joint training workshop on the issues particular to the management of natural and cultural resource collections within an ecosystem context.

*(**Hitchcock and McNicoll**—continued on page 32*